

## Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 266563

17

ORIGIN EB-02

INFO OCT-01 EUR-01 ISO-00 /004 R

666

DRAFTED BY EB:JMDERHAM:EM

APPROVED BY EB:JMDERHAM

----- 096046

R 111427Z NOV 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON 0000

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 266563

FOR DEPUTY ASST SECRETARY JULIUS L. KATZ

FOL REPEAT MTN GENEVA 8440 SENT ACTION SECSTATE NOV 7

QTE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE MTN GENEVA 8440

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: MTN ETRD

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON REVISED LDC STRATEGY PAPER

SUMMARY: MTN DEL FINDS REVISED LDC STRATEGY PAPER CONCERNING SPECIAL AND DIFFERENTIATED TREATMENT AND SPECIAL PROCEDURES IN FAVOR OF LDC'S TO BE ALL-INCLUSIVE INVENTORY WHICH IS VERY WELL DONE AND SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT OVER EARLIER VERSIONS. FOLLOWING COMMENTS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND POSSIBLE NEW APPROACHES ARE SUBMITTED FROM GENEVA VIEWPOINT. WE WELCOME YOUR REACTIONS TO THESE SUGGESTIONS. END SUMMARY

1. MTN DEL RECOMMENDS A SOMEWHAT MORE REALISTIC APPROACH IN INTRODUCTORY GENERAL CONCEPTS SECTION OF PAPER. STARTING POINT TAKEN IS THAT WE SHOULD BE UNDER NO ILLUSION THAT LDC'S, WHATEVER THE RESULTS OF LIMITED OFFICIAL USE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 STATE 266563

THE MTN, WILL BE SATISFIED, IN PART BECAUSE THE US AND OTHER DC'S CANNOT RESPOND POSITIVELY TO THEIR MAJOR DEMANDS SUCH AS BINDING GSP, EXEMPTION FROM SAFEGUARDS, COUNTERVAILING DUTY AND ANTI-DUMPING ACTIONS.

MTN DEL THUS VIEWS BASIC QUESTION AS WHAT WE CAN DO WITHIN OUR LEGISLATIVE MANDATE TO FURTHER IMPROVE THE OUTCOME FOR LDC'S BY RESPONDING WITHIN OUR POLITICAL COMMITMENT TO SPECIAL AND DIFFERENTIATED TREATMENT WHEN FEASIBLE AND APPROPRIATE. LDC'S IN ANY EVENT WILL OBTAIN US GSP (BY A COINCIDENCE IN TIMING) AND SOME REDUCTIONS IN TARIFF ESCALATION. OUR OBJECTIVE SHOULD BE TO ENCOURAGE LDC'S TO STAY WITHIN THE TRADING SYSTEM THROUGH SUCH METHODS AS ALLOWING THEIR MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPING NEW TRADING RULES AND BY ENCOURAGING RECIPROCAL CONCESSIONS (IN MANY CASES CONCESSIONS IN THEIR LONG-RUN ECONOMIC INTERESTS) ON THEIR PART TO ALLOW MORE MEANINGFUL US CONCESSIONS. BASIC GOALS TO DRAW LDC SUPPORT TO GATT-TYPE FORUM IN WHICH DECISIONS ARE MADE BY CONSENSUS RATHER THAN FORA IN WHICH POLITICAL BARGAINING PREDOMINATES AND STEAMROLLER TACTICS ARE THE MODALITIES. WITH RESPECT TO TOKYO COMMITMENTS, MTN DEL NOTES A GROWING PROPENSITY ON PART OF MAJOR LDC'S (BRAZIL, INDIA, MEXICO) TO SPEAK OF SPECIAL PROCEDURES WHEN THEY MEAN SPECIAL RESULTS BEFORE NEGOTIATIONS ARE JOINED. PAPER SHOULD CLEARLY DRAW DISTINCTION BETWEEN SPECIAL PROCEDURES (WITHIN MEANING OF PARA 10 OF TOKYO DECLARATION) AND SPECIAL TREATMENT (PARA 5).

## 2. TARIFFS

A. TWO SEPARATE PROPOSALS ARE CONTAINED IN PROPOSAL IIA(1) RECOMMEND THAT CONCEPT OF DELAYING EROSION OF GSP MARGINS BY SLOWER STAGING OF MFN REDUCTIONS BE SET OUT AS A SEPARATE LAST PROPOSAL OF VERY LIMITED APPLICATION AS EXPLAINED IN PARA 1 OF "HOW SECTION".

B. PROPOSAL IIA(4) IS LIKELY TO BE UNREALISTIC.

SEVERAL LDC'S HAVE INDICATED THAT THEY DO NOT EXPECT LDCS'S TO APPLY THE TARIFF FORMULA AND ATTEMPTS TO APPLY A GENERAL FORMULA, SUCH AS SPECIFIC LDC'S WILL APPLY THE NEGOTIATING RULE TO SPECIFIED PERCENTAGE OF LINE ITEMS, WILL BE RESISTED. A MORE LIKELY ACCEPTABLE APPROACH FOR LIMITED LDC PARTICIPATION IN TARIFF CUT-LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 STATE 266563

THING MIGHT BE THAT CONCESSIONS AFFECTING PRODUCTS FOR WHICH CERTAIN LDC'S ARE THE LEADING OR SUBSTANTIAL SUPPLIER BE RECIPROCATED. ALTERNATEVLY, LDC RECIPROCITY COULD EVOLVE THROUGH CROSS-NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE BY US IN AG AND TARIFFS GROUPS.

C. RECOMMEND CHANGE TO LAST INCOMPLETE SENTENCE ON PAGE 7 TO READ "OUR CONSLUSION IS THAT A PERMANENT SYSTEM OF TARIFF PREFERENCES FOR LDC'S IN NOT DESIRABLE."

D. VIEWS ON SPECIAL INR B(3) NEED TO BE ELABORATED UPON. THIS CONCEPT INTIMATELY RELATED, FOR EXAMPLE, TO PROCEDURAL DISCUSSIONS IN TP GROUP ON PLURILATERAL CONSULTATIONS AND CIRCULATION OF OFFERS. WASHINGTON THINK-

ING ON ISSUES SUCH AS PRINCIPAL AND SUBSTANTIAL SUPPLIERS  
AND WHETHER THERE WILL BE INR'S NEEDS TO BE COMMUNICATED.  
E. ELABORATION OF PARA B(2) CONFLICTS WITH PRO-  
POSED SYMPATHY. ACCEPTING THE FACT US IN ISOLATION ON  
PROTOCOL OF THE 16, HOW WE PRESENT OR ARE COMPENSATED  
FOR TRADE DIVERSION NEEDS TO BE DEVELOPED. THERE IS INCREAS-  
ING CURRENCY AMONG LDC'S THAT INTRO LDC NEGOTIATIONS  
UNDER THE PROTOCOL ARE AN APPROPRIATE CONTRIBUTION  
TO THE MTN, A VIEW THAT IS DIFFICULT FOR US TO ACCEPT.

3. SAFEGUARDS:

A. LDC'S RECOGNIZE THAT COMPLETE EXEMPTION FROM  
ESCAPE CLAUSE ACTIONS NOT LIKELY. SHORT OF THIS, THEY  
WANT SELECTIVE APPLICATION OF SAFEGUARDS THAT EXEMPTS  
DEVELOPING COUNTRY TRADE WHEN NOT THE CAUSE OF INJURY.  
THEY ALSO WANT DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT COMPARED TO ACTIONS  
AGAINST DC'S OS THAT IF SAFEGUARDS IMPOSED THEY WILL  
BE, FOR SHORTER PERIODS WITH MANDATORY ADJUSTMENT ASSIS-  
TANCE, WITH NO ACTION UNLESS INJURY PROVEN AND ALL OF  
THESE UNDER A VERY STRICT SURVEILLANCE BODY THAT ENFORCES  
THEM. SUGGESTED POSITION ON WHAT WE MIGHT DO FOR THE  
LDC'S IS THAT THE US SHOULD SEEK A SAFEGUARD SYSTEM THAT  
HAS MORE MULTILATERAL SCRUTINY, THAT REQUIRES SLIGHTLY  
MORE STRINGENT REQUIREMENTS BEFORE TAKING SAFEGUARD  
ACTION, AND THAT RECOGNIZES THAT DC EXPORTERS HAVE  
GREATER POTENTIAL TO DISRUPT MARKETS AND CAUSE INJURY.  
WITH RESPECT TO STRATEGY, US SHOULD POINT OUT TO LDC'S  
THAT US POSITION FOR NEW SYSTEM CONTAINS MANY POINTS  
COMMON TO LDC PROPOSALS, THAT US IS ONLY COUNTRY  
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 STATE 266563

THAT NOW REGULARLY GIVES COMPENSATION, NOTIFIES AND  
CONSULTS BEFORE ITS ACTIONS, AND HAS OPERATING ADJUST-  
MENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM. SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO HOW  
WE MIGHT DO THIS INCLUDE FOLLOWING:  
PROCEDURES: SPECIAL PRE-NOTIFICATION AND CONSULTATION  
REQUIREMENTS; SEPARATE SURVEILLANCE BODY; TIMELY REVIEW  
BY SURVEILLANCE BODY.  
CRITERIA FOR INJURY: ESTABLISHING OF ACTUAL RATHER  
THAN THREAT OF INJURY; MINIMUM IMPORT PENETRATION LEVELS;  
MINIMUM PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL IMPORT LEVELS.  
STANDARD FOR RELIEF: MORE RECENT PREVIOUS REPRESENT-  
ATIVE PERIOD, HIGHER GROWTH RATES, SHORTER PERIOD OF  
IMPOSITION, LINKED TO ADJUSTMENT.  
SURVEILLANCE: FREQUENT REVIEW OF ACTIONS AND A  
MORE DETAILED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.  
B. ADDITIONAL REFINEMENTS TO LDC POSITIONS IN-  
CLUDED THE FOLLOWING: SAFEGUARD ACTIONS SHOULD NOT  
THEMSELVES CAUSE SERIOUS INJURY TO EXPORTING LDC ECONOMY;  
SELECTIVE APPLICATION WOULD APPLY ONLY TO IMPORTS OF DC'S;  
PROVISION SHOULD BE MADE FOR NEW ENTRANTS TO THE IMPORT-

ING MARKET.

4. NON-TARIFF MEASURES:

A. SUBSIDIES/COUNTERVAILING: US STRATEGY AT THIS STAGE SHOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH POSITION PAPER FOR NOV MEETING: NAMELY THAT WE BELIEVE S&D WILL PROVE FEASIBLE WITHIN PRESCRIBED CONDITIONS AND TO INVITE LDC PROPOSALS. VIEWED REALISTICALLY, MOST FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVE FOR SPECIAL AND DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR LDC'S IN THIS AREAS WOULD APPEAR TO BE APPLICATION OF AN INJURY PROVISION TO ALL LDC'S SUBSIDY PRACTICES, WHETHER CHARACTERIZED AS RED OR AMBER. ADOPTION OF INJURY CRITERIA WOULD REPLACE PROPOSALS IV(A) 1 AND 2. WE ARE INTRIGUED BY POSSIBILITY OF A "WAIVER" CONCEPT. HOWEVER, WE FEEL THIS OBJECTIVE COULD BE ACHIEVED IN PRACTICE BY REQUIRING INJURY FUNDING. WITH RESPECT TO INJURY CRITERIA, WE BELIEVE IT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT TO GAIN ACCEPTANCE OF DIFFERENT INJURY TESTS FOR LDC'S, PARTICULARLY PARA IV(A)4 WHEN LDC'S ALREADY ENJOY DIFFERENT INJURY TEST FOR A WIDE VARIETY OF ITEMS COVERED UNDER GSP. APPLICATION OF SAFEGUARD INJURY TEST TO LDC'S FURTHER COMPLICATED BY LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 05 STATE 266563

SIGNIFICANT POSSIBILITY OF S&D TREATMENT IN SAFEGUARDS, RESULTING IN SPIRALING S&D TREATMENT FOR LDC'S. PROBLEM IS STATE OF SPECIFIC US INDUSTRY, NOT THE CONDITION IN FOREIGN SUPPLIERS' ECONOMY. WITH RESPECT TO GRADUATION, WHETHER FOR LDC COUNTRY OR SPECIFIC LDC INDUSTRY, THIS IS AN EXTREMELY COMPLEX TOPIC WHICH MAY MERIT A SEPARATE NEGOTIATION IN ITSELF.

B. STANDARDS: PROPOSALS 1 AND 2 ALREADY IN DRAFT STANDARDS CODE (ARTICLE 17). WE SHOULD START GIVING SOME THOUGHT TO SPECIFICS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TECHNICAL TRAINING WE ARE PREPARED TO MAKE AVAILABLE, OR TO SUPPORT THROUGH OTHER INSTITUTIONS. THIS IS QUESTION LDC'S WILL ASK, AND OUR ANSWER WILL BE FACTOR IN EVENTUAL LDC DECISION WHETHER TO ADHERE TO THE CODE. ADDITIONAL POSSIBILITIES FOR CONSIDERATION:

(1) INCLUSION IN CODE OF PROPOSAL (UNDER DISCUSSION) THAT REASONABLE ADVANCE NOTICE BE GIVEN PRIOR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A STANDARD, PARTICULARLY GIVEN LDC NEED FOR MORE TIME TO ADJUST.

(2) EXPLORE POSSIBILITY OF SOME TYPE OF LDC DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT VIA THE DISPUTE SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE.

C. LICENSING: THIS IS AN AREA IN WHICH LDC PARTICIPATION COULD BE CONSIDERED AS A "CREDIT" IN RECIPROCITY SENSE.

5. AGRICULTURE: PARA V(1) AND (3) ARE TOO GENERAL IN APPLICATION. MTN DEL BELIEVES THAT WORK ON SPECIFIC COMMODITIES BOTH AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL SHOULD BE

INITIATED TO DETERMINE FEASIBILITY OF THESE PROPOSALS.  
RECOMMEND THAT PARA V(4) OVERTAKEN BY US PROPOSAL IN  
SEPT AG MEETING.

6. SUPPLY ACCESS: SECTION MIGHT NOTE THAT LDC'S HAVE  
SCRCELY BEEN WILLING TO DISCUSS THIS SUBJECT, MUCH  
LESS TO MAKE DEMANDS. AT SAME TIME THE US AND OTHER  
MAJOR DEVELOPED COUNTRIES HAVE BEEN SLOW TO SPECIFY WHAT  
THEY WANT UNDER HEADING OF SUPPLY ACCESS, ALTHOUGH  
DISCUSSION COMMONLY CENTERS ON (1) A SET OF GUIDELINES  
ON EXPORT RESTRICTIONS AND (2) POSSIBILITY OF EXCHANGING  
SPECIFIC COMMITMENTS TO IMPROVE THE CONDITIONS OF  
AVAILABILITY (I.E., ACCESS) OF PARTICULAR COMMODITIES AND  
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 06 STATE 266563

PRODUCTS. IT IS PARADOXICALLY ONE AREA WHICH LDC'S  
REFUSE TO DISCUSS BUT IN WHICH THEY MAY HAVE CONSIDERABLE  
BARGAINING LEVERAGE. THUS ITEMS CONSIDERED UNDER "WHAT  
WE MIGHT DO" ALMOST INVARIABLY REPRESENT, MORE THAN MOST  
OTHER ITEMS IN THIS PAPER, ONLY ONE SIDE OF WHAT COULD  
BE A RECIPROCAL ARRANGEMENT. THE LIST OF POSSIBLE ACTIONS  
NEED TO BE CLARIFIED AND EXPANDED AS FOLLOWS:

A. (APRA (VI)1): WE DOUBT WHETHER THE PAPER SHOULD,  
AS IT SEEMS TO, ENDORSE THE IMPORTANCE OF LIMITING EXPORTS  
OF RAW MATERIALS IN ORDER TO INCREASE PROCESSING. THE  
OPERATPONAL MEANING OF THIS CONCEPT IS NOT CLEAR UNLESS  
IT IMPLIES GIVING SOME SORT OF A PRIOR BLESSING TO  
SOME KINDS OF EXPORT RESTRICTIONS--AND IT IS BY NO  
MEANS CLEAR THAT RESTRICTIONS ARE IN FACT EFFECTIVE  
MEANS OF ENCOURAGING PROCESSING. TO THE CONTRARY THEY  
MAY HAVE A DAMENING EFFECT. IF THE OBSERVATION THAT  
"REDUCED TARIFFS MAY NOT SUFFICIENT" IS INTENDED TO  
SUGGEST THE NEED FOR POSITIVE MEASURES, BEYOND TARIFF  
DE-ESCALATION, TO ENCOURAGE PROCESSING, THEN THIS SHOULD  
BE STATED ECPLICITLY AND, IDEALLY, SOME ILLUSTRATIVE  
LIST OF SUCH ADDITIONAL MEASURES SHOULD BE GIVEN.  
THE STATEMENT THAT "SOMETIMES MARKET ACCESS COMMITMENTS  
MIGHT BE GIVNE FOR FUTURE SUPPLY ACCESS COMMITEMENTS" IS  
AMBIGUOUS. DOES IT MEAN MARKET ACCESS FOR CONTINGENCY  
COMMITMENTS ON SUPPLU AVAILABILITY? AN EXAMPLE OR TWO  
WOULD HELP.

B. (PARA (VI)2): IT SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED, HOWEVER, THAT AT LEAST  
FOR THE US THESE ARE LIKELY TO BE EXTRAORDINARY SITUATIONS, FEW  
AND FAR BETWEEN, AND THE WORTH OF A CONCESSION OF THIS  
SORT MUST BE JUDGED ACCORDINGLY. ON A DIFFERENT POINT,  
IT IS UNCLEAR FROM THE DISCUSSION IN "HOW" (2) WHETHER  
THE IDEA OF QUANTITY GUARANTEES AND CONCESSIONAL AND  
AID SALES APPLIES STRICTLY TO US AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS,  
OR WHETHER OTHERS ON WHICH WE HAVE HAD EXPORT CONTROLS  
(E.G., FERROUS SCRAP, FERTILIZER, HIDES) WOULD ALSO BE  
COVERED (THIS WOULD BE A MUCH GREATER DEPARTURE FROM THE

STATUS QUO).

C. (NEW PARA VI)3): TAKE A FAIRLY GENEROUS ATTITUDE  
IN GIVING LDC RECIPROCITY CREDIT FOR SUPPLY-RELATED CON-  
CESSIONS, EVEN IF THESE ARE MORE OF THE TOKEN VARIETY.  
WE CAN PERHAPS EASE THE BURDEN ON LDC'S OF GIVING RECI-  
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 07 STATE 266563

PROCITY, WITHOUT SACRIFICING THE PRINCIPLE, BE GIVING  
CREDIT FOR SUPPLY-RELATED CONCESSIONS WHICH WE MIGHT  
NOT HAVE IN GREAT INTEREST IN BUT WHICH AN LDC IS WILL-  
ING TO ABIDE BY. IN SOME CASES THIS WOULD BE LARGELY  
OPTICAL, BUT COULD BE A CONSTRUCTIVE STEP IN A POLITICAL  
SENSE. WE WOULD SUPPOSE THAT LDC RECIPROCITY UNDER THE  
HEADING OF SUPPLY ACCESS MIGHT INCLUDE SUCH ITEMS  
AS: GUARANTEED AVAILABILITY OF SPECIFIC AMOUNTS OF  
IMPORTANT COMMODITIES;  
AN ASSURANCE THAT EXPORT TAXES WILL NOT BE LEVIED ON PARTICULAR  
PRODUCTS; AN ASSURANCE THAT PRODUCTION CUTBACKS AND  
EXPORT RESTRICTIONS WILL NOT BE IMPOSED IN ORDER TO  
DRIVE PRICES UP; CONSULTATION COMMITMENTS; ETC. THESE  
ARE NOT LISTED IN PART X.

7. TRADE REFORM: AS WE HAD COMMENTED ON EARLIER DRAFT  
OF THIS PAPER, THERE IS NOT PARTICULAR DIFFICULTY IN  
DELAYING A CONSIDERATION WHICH IS NOT LIKELY TO BEGIN  
IN MANY FORESEEABLE TIME IN THE FUTURE. IT IS CERTAINLY  
NOT THE US INTENTION TO PROPOSE SUCH A GENERAL OVERHAUL,  
AND IN FACT WE ARE AT PRESENT HOPING TO AVOID CREATION  
OF A SEPARATE GROUP ON THE SUBJECT. AT THE SAME TIME,  
AS WE HAVE SUGGESTED BEFORE, WASHINGTON MAY WISH TO  
PREPARE A SPECIFIC EXPLANATION OF WHY WE DO NOT WANT TO  
SEE PART IV CHANGED, OR IF WE CAN SEE PARTS OF IT  
CHANGED, WHICH THESE ARE AND IN WHICH DIRECTION.  
ARTICLE XVIII SHOULD BE GIVEN THE SAME SCRUTINY. WALKER

UNQTE  
INGERSOLL

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 26 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 11 NOV 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** CunninFX  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975STATE266563  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** EB:JMDERHAM:EM  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** D750393-0034  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19751190/baaaadaw.tel  
**Line Count:** 313  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ORIGIN EB  
**Original Classification:** LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 6  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** CunninFX  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 20 JUN 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <20 JUN 2003 by izenbei0>; APPROVED <04 NOV 2003 by CunninFX>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** n/a  
**TAGS:** ETRD, XX, MTN  
**To:** n/a INFO LONDON  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006